

E

675

H67





Class E 675

Book H 67









# ADDRESS OF HON. GEO. F. HOAR

*At the Organization of the Grant and Wilson Club of Worcester, in Mechanics Hall,  
August 13, 1872.—[Published by the Club.]*

I cannot describe to you the sense of infinite longing with which, as the session of Congress wore away, I looked forward to a return to my home, to the practice of my profession, and the society of my children, hoping that I might leave to others the duties, the labors, the honors, and the prizes of this campaign. But the occasion does not permit any man who loves the Republic, or is under any weight of obligation to the great party that saved and purified it, to consider any other question than how he may best serve their cause.

This is the first presidential election in which every grown man in the Republic has been entitled to take a part. It is the first since 1860 in which every State may take a share. The process of restoration, not too long delayed for the safety of the Republic, is at last complete. Every State is in its place, every senator's chair is full, every district enjoys its rightful representation.

It is a time of general peace. The flag with its thirty-seven stars floats over every sea and is honored in every land. The most powerful and proudest monarchy of the West, for the first time in her history, has apologized for a great wrong, and a tribunal now sits by the shores of the beautiful and classic lake of Geneva, before which we are holding her as a defendant to make atonement for her offence. In the East, Japan, a nation equal in population to ourselves, roused by the sound of our mighty footsteps from her barbarous sleep of ages, sits docile at our feet, learning civilization, manners, laws, religion.

It is a time, also, of general prosperity. In spite of the war, in spite of the loss from the estimate of the value of the slaves, the valuation of the wealth of the nation has increased from sixteen thousand to twenty-nine thousand millions of dollars in ten years. The manufactures of the country have increased in ten years from \$1,885,861,676 to \$4,305,932,032. Of this our own state and county have their full share. Not, as in slave holding times, has the legislation of the general government been guided by hatred or jealousy toward you,

but every regulation of finance, tariff, currency, taxation, has been in accordance with your general views and under the direction of your own chosen and trusted statesmen. I believe that no great industry of Massachusetts, or of Worcester, has reason to complain of any recent legislation.

Better than the statistics of wealth are the statistics of manhood. Every slave has become a freeman, every freeman a citizen, every citizen has become a voter.

Amid all this sunshine there is but one cloud which rises like an exhalation of blood where the rebellion lately went down.

In this condition of things two great parties and a little one present themselves. They ask you to choose between Grant and Greeley; between Wilson and Gratz Brown; between the candidates of the Republicans everywhere and the candidates of the Democracy. What is best for the Republic? To which shall we give our confidence? We do not ask merely which makes the best promises, but which shall be trusted to keep them. Which has done most to win for us these blessings? Which will do most to continue them?

I will detain you for a few moments only while I ask you whether the promises of 1868 have not been kept? I think the promises made in the Chicago platform of 1868 have been kept by the Republican party beyond even their own expectations.

The Chicago platform of 1868 consisted of fourteen resolutions, declaring a policy in regard to six great subjects: 1. Equal rights and equal suffrage; 2. Payment of the public debt; 3. Reduction of taxation; 4. Honesty and economy of administration; 5. Encouraging immigration, especially opposition to the doctrine of European governments that once a subject always a subject; 6. Amnesty.

Now I submit to you, fellow citizens, without fear of contradiction, that in regard to each of these things, not only has the Republican party accomplished more than four years ago any of us dared to hope, but it has accomplished more than any other

E 675  
.467

administration ever did, or tried to do. In these great particulars it will stand out conspicuous and illustrious, a mighty landmark in history, I repeat, not only has the Republican party more than kept its pledges on all these great heads of legislation, each one as important as any ever dealt with by any administration before, but it has accomplished in regard to each more than any other administration, or any other government on earth, ever hoped or tried to do.

First, as to equal suffrage. What government or administration ever bestowed on mankind a jewel precious as the fifteenth amendment? the last of the three great amendments to our constitution, standing out brilliant and conspicuous in our history, and which have been well compared to three blazing stars in the belt of Orion which give glory and splendor to the skies. You will I am sure agree with me that no other government has ever bestowed on mankind a boon like that.

Next, as to payment of the public debt, honesty and economy of administration, and reduction of taxation. Listen to these figures, more eloquent than any figures of speech. I would not shine in borrowed plumes. I take them from a recent speech of Mr. Dawes, whose service as chairman of appropriations and ways and means has made him probably the best authority in the country on this special theme. You will, I know, give full confidence to Mr. Dawes, never a blind follower of party, a sharp, fearless, and I think sometimes a too hasty critic even of his friends.

There has been paid of the public debt, \$331,000,000. Saving of annual interest, \$22,500,000; funded at lower rate of interest, \$209,000,000; saving of annual interest \$28,000,000. Currency brought from 37 per cent. below par to 12.

Taxes and tariff duties by which \$145,000,000 levied have been repealed. Expenditures less per head than in 1860—1869, \$2.05 per head; 1870, \$1.61 per head.

Cash balances against collectors 1-10 of 1 per cent.; when what is collectable is paid in all but 1-50th of 1 per cent will have been collected.

Of the customs, out of \$553,000,000 all but \$28,000, or 1-55 of one per cent. have been collected.

The treasurer has been in office 11½ years; has received and paid out fifty-five thousand millions; lost but \$55,000—one ten-thousandth of 1 per cent.

The defalcations, according to Mr. Boutwell were, under Lincoln, \$2,700,000, under Johnson, \$1,700,000, under Grant, \$64,000. What government on earth ever paid a debt equal to the reduction that has been made in ours? What government can show such reduction of taxes in three years? What government such economy and honesty; in these four great particulars also you will, I

am sure, agree with me no government can make such a showing.

The claim to hold their subjects in perpetual allegiance, so long discussed, which European sovereigns have so strenuously maintained, has at last been yielded to the peaceful diplomacy of Gen. Grant. The American citizen of German or of British birth is hereafter to be subjected to no other claim than those of his adopted country. Here, too, is an achievement better than we are promised which no other government and no other administration can match. The removal of this old claim of despotism, which even the war of 1812 did not break down, would in any other time have been enough of itself to have given renown to an administration; but the brilliancy of this exploit is hardly noticed amid the splendors of that of Grant.

So, too, in the matter of amnesty has the administration not only exceeded the promise of the platform, but exhibited a clemency unparalleled in history. This is a matter much misunderstood, and I ought to explain it briefly. Many people suppose that large numbers of the rebels are still disfranchised. The fact is otherwise. The elective franchise has been restored to every person within the government, notwithstanding his share in the rebellion. But the constitution makes, as it ought, certain provisions as to qualification for office. It provides that no person under twenty-one shall hold office, that none under twenty-five be a representative, none under thirty a senator, and no man of foreign birth or under thirty-five be President. State constitutions and statutes contain many like provisions for the public safety. So the fourteenth amendment declares that persons who had taken an oath to support the constitution and thereafter taken part in the rebellion shall not hold office unless their disabilities are removed by Congress by two-thirds vote. The offence supposes the addition of perjury to treason. Even then the exclusion from office is not absolute, but the party has only to satisfy Congress that he has changed his mind! So generous has Congress been that there is no instance of the refusal of the prayer of any person who has asked relief. Many thousands have been pardoned by name, and at the last session, Congress passed a law removing the disabilities of all but a few individuals who had held seats in two Congresses and left them to take part in the rebellion. England has always brought her rebels to the block or the gallows. You know the bloody fate of the unhappy but brave communists of France. The Tories of our revolution were exiled to foreign lands and their estates confiscated. Gen. Grant gave orders to our officers abroad, if any misguided rebel, found wandering and destitute in foreign lands, desired to return, to bring him home at the pub-



lie charge. Surely here, too, no administration or government in history ever equalled in clemency that of Gen. Grant.

Such is the record of the past three years. So serves the Republic in peace the great captain who saved her in war. I do not claim, of course, that these things were done by the President alone, any more than I claim that he took Vicksburg or Donelson or Henry, or conquered Lee alone. But as the army could not conquer without a competent general, no administration could be successful without a competent President. As the steadfast inflexible will, the unerring judgment, the unswerving purpose of Grant pervaded our vast armies as if they were the body of one man—so throughout the whole administration has the President been a steady, constant, force in the right direction. You will find all these great measures foreshadowed in the clear and simple messages of the President. Sometimes he has been in advance of Congress and people. The ink was scarce dry on the record at the state department of the adoption of the 15th amendment by the last state, when the President sent in his message to Congress urging them to go to the extent of their constitutional power in assisting the establishment of institutions of education in the states lately in rebellion. No man in Washington has taken deeper interest in the solution of the great problems which affect the welfare of labor. In the matter of reform in the civil service, in removing the appointments as far as possible from politics, he is far in advance of a majority of his own party and has no supporters elsewhere.

Our distinguished fellow citizen, General Devens, quoted, some months since, in an address to his fellow soldiers, the description of Oliver Cromwell, which Macaulay puts into the mouth of Milton:—

"Wherefore you speak contemptibly of his parts, I know not; but I suspect that you are not free from the error common to studious and speculative men. Because Oliver was an ungraceful orator, and never said, either in public or private, anything memorable, you will have it that he was of a mean capacity. Sure this is unjust. Many men have there been ignorant of letters, without wit, without eloquence, who yet had the wisdom to devise and the courage to perform that which they lacked language to explain. Some men often, in troubled times, have worked out the deliverance of nations and their own greatness, not by logic, not by rhetoric, but by wariness in success, by calmness in danger, by fierce and stubborn resolution in all adversity. The hearts of men are their books, events are their tutors, great actions are their eloquence; and such a one, in my judgment, was his late highness, who, if none were to treat his name scornfully now

who shook not at the sound of it while he lived, would, by very few, be mentioned otherwise than with reverence. His own deeds shall avouch him for a great statesman, a great soldier, a true lover of his country, a merciful and generous conqueror."

The whole country recognizes the felicity of the comparison. Certainly no person since has more nearly fulfilled Milton's own portraiture of the great Puritan.

"Our chief of men, who, through a cloud,  
Nor of war only, but detractions rude,  
Guided by faith and matchless fortitude  
To peace and truth thy glorious way hast ploughed,  
And on the neck of crowned fortune proud  
Hast reared God's trophies and his work pursued."  
Yet much remains  
To conquer still; peace hath her victories,  
No less renowned than war.

But the parallel goes no further. Cromwell usurped the supreme power and turned Parliament out of Westminster Hall by main force. Our soldier disbands his army and desists gracefully from urging his cherished measures when they do not meet the approbation of his fellow citizens.

Against this great record of public service and public capacity our Democratic opponents have no man in their own party to oppose. They have, therefore, put in nomination Mr. Horace Greeley of New York.

I have no desire to undervalue Mr. Greeley. He is entitled to the credit of having established and built up a large influential New York newspaper; a difficult work requiring extraordinary business qualities. He has edited it ably, and has shown himself to be a man of generous sympathies. There are many men in America of whom we can say as much. But we are not now seeking to build up a newspaper establishment, or a man to write editorials. We are looking for a man to be President of the United States, for the constitutional head of our armies in war; a man to suggest and execute great measures, and to select the men who are to administer the executive department of the government in peace.

I believe Mr. Greeley to be unfit for this great office. He is unfit by his declared opinions. He is unfit by timidity and want of judgment as shown by his conduct in great public exigencies. He is unfit as shown by his changing his opinions for the sake of the presidency. He is unfit as easily affected in his public conduct by low personal considerations. He is unfit for it as totally unable to form sound judgment as to character, and to discriminate between good men and bad.

Mr. Greeley is unfit by his declared opinions. I will convict him of disloyalty to the idea of the republic in the two great cardinal points of the right to put down rebellion and the equal rights of the citizen.

Mr. Greeley is disloyal to the republic because he believes in the right of secession.

"Whenever any considerable section of this Union shall really insist on getting out of it, we shall insist that they be allowed to go, and we feel assured that the North generally cherishes a kindred determination. So let there be no babble about the ability of the cotton states to whip the North. If they will fight they must hunt up some other enemy, for we are not going to fight them. \* \* \* If the people (not the swashy politicians) of the cotton states shall ever deliberately vote themselves out of the Union, we shall be in favor of letting them go in peace. Then who is to fight? And what for?"—*N. Y. Tribune*, Nov. 2, 1860.

"As to secession, I have said repeatedly, and I here repeat, that if the people of the slave states, or of the cotton states, really wish to get out of the Union, I am in favor of letting them out as soon as that result can be perfectly and constitutionally attained. \* \* If they will only be patient, not rush to seizing federal forts, arsenals, arms and sub-treasuries, but take first deliberately a fair vote by ballot of their own citizens, not being coerced or intimidated, and that vote shall indicate a settled resolve to get out of the Union, I will do all I can to help them out at an early day."—*N. Y. Tribune*, Jan. 14, 1861.

"Mr. Garrett Davis, this tremendous civil war was dreaded and deprecated by no one more than myself. I am one of the few northern men who, to avoid it, would have preferred to let the cotton states go in peace."—*N. Y. Tribune*, April 3, 1862.

These are the dreams of a theorist. They were uttered at a period in the history of the Republic when they had a terrible practical significance. Those little sentences cost hundreds of thousands of loyal lives.

They turned the vote in the Georgia convention, where Robert Toombs read them to the majority against secession, to convince them that there would be no war. They came from the leading Republican paper of the North. They convinced the rebel that he would meet no resistance. They convinced the Unionist he would have no support. I have been told by many eminent Southerners that they opposed secession until those articles came out in the *Tribune*, satisfying them that they would get no support in the North, but were to be left to their fate.

Mr. Greeley is said by his supporters to be a man of great tenacity of purpose, maintaining his opinion against all opposition. Will you put this secessionist in the presidential chair? What Union soldier with an empty sleeve, what father who gave his son to his country, will give his vote to the author of those counsels?

Mr. Greeley is also disloyal to the idea of the Republic on the other great cardinal point of equality of civil rights of the citi-

zen. Mr. Sumner declares this the most important issue before the people, and I think he is right. I read to you from the *New York Tribune* of January 17, 1872, a remarkable extract from a speech delivered by Mr. Greeley to the colored men at Poughkeepsie:

"I hope the time will come when our educational institutions and seminaries will be open to men of all races with a freedom, with a hospitality which has never yet been enjoyed. I trust the time will come when no man's color will exclude him from any church or any religious organization whatever. But though that time should come, I am not at all sure that the colored race will not, as they do now as a rule, prefer their own society, and prefer to have churches and seminaries and colleges of their own. Nor am I clear that this would not be a wise choice. So then, I say, with regard to our common schools, where a rural district contains but 25 or 30 families, it is simply impossible, where two or three of those are colored, to have separate schools; and in those cases, to say that black children shall not go to school with white children is to say that they shall not have any school whatever. But in communities such as these, while if I were a black man, I should not ask a separate school, yet I should still say if the whites chose to have separate schools I should not object to it. I should only ask that the schools for my children should be made as good, as sufficient, as schools provided for other men's children. Then if the majority chose that the minority should be educated in separate schools, I should say, 'Gentlemen, be it as you please: I have no choice in the matter.' A gentleman or lady never discusses the question. 'Was it proper to refuse me an invitation to my neighbor's party?' He or she accepts the fact and lets the reason take care of itself. Precisely so with regard to religious fraternity or associations for maintenance of divine worship. I would advise the colored man never to make a distinction, and never to refuse one. If the whites choose that the blacks shall not be members on equal terms of general congregations, I should accept exclusive congregations, not as my choice, but as the choice of the dominant race."

This speech of Mr. Greeley was made at Poughkeepsie, N. Y., May 16, 1872, after his nomination at Cincinnati, and while he was hoping and expecting the Democratic endorsement at Baltimore. The sentence I have read to you is in my judgment compacted of treason against Republicanism. It shows that the man, whatever truths he may at times have seen clearly, has not yet got rid of the old prejudice on which slavery was based. He is speaking of the common schools, paid for from the common treasury, supported by a common tax! Anything

that recognizes inferiority of race there, recognizes it in the beginning of life. The policy of which Mr. Greeley is speaking is to teach the infant Republican at the public charge distinctions founded on race. What would be thought of a law which should propose to shut out Baptist, or Catholic, or Universalist children from the society of the children of their fellow-citizens in the public school? And what would be thought of the statesman who should counsel their parents to submit quietly to such degradation? What constitutes a state? "Men who know their rights, and, knowing, dare maintain." Not so, says Mr. Greeley—"Leave your rights to the dominant race." The *dominant* race. No man here is so ignorant as not to know the meaning of that detestable word. It is from the same root as dominate, domineer, dominion, and the other phrases of Latin origin which express the hateful idea of mastership of man over man. There can be no dominant race without a servile race, over whom it is dominant. There may be Democrats in this audience who are willing to vote for the author of that sentence. But what old anti-slavery man, what free-soiler, what Republican?

Mr. Greeley is unfit for this great office, as shown by rashness, timidity and want of judgment in great public exigencies. Time will allow me to advert to but two proofs of this charge, but two so conspicuous that they ought alone to deprive him of all future claim to the confidence of his countrymen. In July, 1861, with the same presumption which now seeks to instruct our farmers in agriculture, he undertook to teach General Scott the art of war. Keeping at the head of his paper the motto "On to Richmond," taunting the military authorities with imbecility, imputing to General Scott that he was not earnest in a desire to put down rebellion, he excited a public sentiment which made the forward movement a necessity. It is to his credit that he afterward confessed his terrible mistake. Here, again, thousands of loyal lives paid for his folly and presumption.

Again, in the autumn of 1864, when the rebellion was driven to the wall, he undertook to put new hope into its despondent chiefs by undertaking to substitute negotiation for arms, expressing his willingness to pay the old slave owners for their slaves at the public charge. What disgrace and ignominy to the country had this counsel prevailed? Whether he has changed his mind in this particular I do not know.

He is unfit for this great office, as shown by his changing his opinion for the sake of the Presidency. He now pretends to be in favor of the one term principle, as a means of defeating his competitor. But in June, 1871, in a public speech, he recommended the re-nomination of Gen. Grant, and avowed he would be better qualified for a

second term than a first.

"Gen. Grant has never been defeated, and he never will be.

"While asserting the right of every Republican to his untrammelled choice of a candidate for next President until a nomination is made, I venture to suggest that Gen. Grant will be far better qualified for that momentous trust in 1872 than he was in 1868."—*Horace Greeley, speech on 4th January, 1871.*

He repeated the same doctrine as lately as March, 11, 1871. In May 4, 1871, he stated in his paper that he had received some thirty or forty letters requesting him to be a candidate for the presidency. From that time for several months, he advocated the one term principle, but declared that it would be his duty to support Gen. Grant, if nominated by the Republican party.

"When a Republican national convention, fairly chosen after free consultation and frank interchange of opinions, shall have nominated Republican candidates for President and Vice President, we expect to urge all Republicans to give them a hearty, effective support, whether they be or be not of those whose original preference has been gratified. Until that time Mr. Greeley will maintain the perfect and equal right of every Republican to indicate and justify his preference, whether it favor the incumbent or some other Republican."—*Tribune, Aug. 10, 1871.*

This was after everything which is now made an accusation against Grant had happened. Especially did he defend the conduct of President Grant, in regard to San Domingo and the kuklux legislation.

Mr. Greeley is also unfit for this great office, because he is easily affected in his public conduct by low personal considerations of patronage and favor.

There is a little pamphlet, published by the Union Republican Committee, entitled "The Greeley Record," which I wish might be in the hands of every intelligent voter. It is Mr. Greeley's picture of himself. It consists of extracts from his writings, speeches and letters. What a disclosure of vanity and weakness, of arrogance before the event and repentance afterward, of petty personal ambitions, of meddling with things of which he is ignorant, of foolish and timid counsel those extracts contain. In one sentence he says "it seems to us unwise in an editor ever to allow his name to go before the public as a candidate for any party nomination." Then he scolds that he has not been offered offices in reward of his party service. He writes a long letter to Gov. Seward in 1854, in which he gives notice of the dissolution of what he calls "the firm of Seward, Weed and Greeley." There is not a word in it of principle, of public interest or public duty, but only complaint that this, that and the other of-

fice has not been given to him. It is in the style and tone of a New York ward room politician. Fancy our consternation and amazement if we should learn that any man whom we have been accustomed to respect (Gov. Andrew for example) had written such a production as that. I believe Mr. Sumner would have held his right hand in a brazier of burning coals until it was burned to a stump before he would have put his name to such a document. Contrast Mr. Greeley's revelation of himself with his description of President Grant.

"From the beginning to the end of that great struggle, Ulysses S. Grant rose through every grade known to our service. A poor, friendless, private citizen, he volunteered at the outset, and was chosen captain of a company. He was soon made Adjutant, then Colonel, then Brigadier-General, then Major-General, then Lieutenant-General, and finally General-in-Chief. Yet nobody ever heard of his asking for a better post. In every case of his promotion he took the position wherein he was wanted. No one ever heard of his wanting a better one than he already had. 'Friend, come up higher,' was the mandate addressed to this lowly servant of the Republic—not that he wanted promotion, but that the country sorely needed the right man in the right place. He favored no 'policy' but the crushing out of the rebellion. He had no conception of duty that led him to regard the federal executive with distrust or disfavor. In short, Grant quietly received his orders, and to the extent of his ability, executed them. It will be the fault of the people if this species of generalship is not more common hereafter."—*Tribune*, July 22d, 1868.

You know, I suppose, the history of the efforts made to break up the corruptions in New York—corruptions so vast that the thieves stole from the public treasury, not by thousands but by millions, and which were cited by our enemies the world over as their strongest argument against the principle of self-government itself. No man supposes Mr. Greeley to be responsible for these things. It has been said that he engaged in some business adventure in company with Tweed. But I am quite sure that an inquiry into the fact would acquit him of everything but imprudence in the choice of his associates. But he is justly chargeable with letting his miserable jealousies about patronage and the spoils of office prevent him from giving hearty and manly aid in correcting this great abuse. I read your letter written during the memorable New York campaign of 1871, in answer to an application from his Republican associates to take his place in the approaching battle.

New York, April 9, 1871.

Dear Sir.—It gives me no pleasure to advise you, and the committee of which you

are the head, that I am obliged to decline the part assigned to me by the state committee in the proposed reorganization of the Republican party of our city. *Had a little forbearance and consideration been evinced by the appointing power at Washington, I think this might have been different.* Yours,

HORACE GREELEY.

Mr. Greeley has been tried in public office, once as a member of Congress for a short term, once as a member of the New York constitutional convention. A weaker and more worthless member never took a seat in either.

Mr. Greeley is unfit for this great office, as totally unable to form sound judgments as to character and discriminate between good men and bad.

In support of this judgment, I cite the testimony of one who has known him long and intimately, and who is now one of his most influential supporters:

"No persons more than his brethren of the press recognize his great worth, his large and varied abilities, and the vast obligations the country is under to him; but they object to his high protectionism, to the manner in which his nomination was secured, and to the miserable set of small and jobbing politicians that have so long and so thoroughly surrounded him, and influenced him alike strongly and perversely in much of his political conduct."—*Mr. Booke* (S. B.) in *Springfield Republican*, May 4, 1872.

Before I leave this contrast of the two candidates, I ought to advert for a moment to some personal charges which have been made against President Grant.

The American people are surely too generous and intelligent to give credence to such accusations simply because they are made. Against every President they have been uttered with equal clamor. His detractors almost overcame the resolute spirit of Washington. They stung nearly to madness the sensitive and fiery John Adams. Jefferson, in letters now existing in this very city, addressed to his intimate friend, the elder Levi Lincoln, complains bitterly of the same thing. John Quincy Adams was defeated when a candidate for re-election, by the accounts of the extravagant and sumptuous furnishing of the large east room at the White House, which, in fact, was not furnished at all, and where good Mrs. Adams used to hang her week's washing. Calumny invaded the domestic circle of Jackson, and did not spare his wife. Lincoln was believed in a large section of the country to have the habits of a drunkard and the manners and appearance of a baboon.

The same charge has been made against Gen. Grant. Of course I cannot say whether, in former years, in periods of discouragement and distress, he ever yielded to temptation. If he ever did, I honor the

will that shook off such a habit and made him what he is. This thing I do know, that having seen Gen. Grant personally, in business and in society, daytime and evening, having known intimately many persons who are his intimates, including several members of his cabinet, seeing constantly members of Congress, both friend and foe, I never heard any such charge from any one of them, and I do not think any one of them ever entertained such a belief. A constant attendant at church, always ready and constant at business, receiving at all hours of the day and evening; when driving out in society accompanied always by wife and children, it is simply impossible the thing can be true. I have here one testimonial which ought to silence this charge forever.

Let me read a brief extract from a speech of Mr. Burchard, the successor of Minister Washburne, who represents the Galena district, and is a near neighbor of Gen. Grant. Mr. Burchard is a man of the highest character and intelligence, independent of party almost to a fault. He was addressing the near neighbors of Grant in his own home, who knew his habits and character. The vice of drunkenness cannot be concealed. It is like the ointment of the hand that bewrayeth itself.

"They say Grant's personal habits incapacitate him for office. His habits were not very bad as a general in our armies—he was surely very successful for a man of bad habits. But that charge is wholly false. I have seen General Grant from day to day, between the first day of December and the eleventh day of June last. Daily from 10 A. M. to 4 P. M., he was sitting in the President's room, receiving calls, and attending to the business of the government. I am ashamed before you, some of you old neighbors of General Grant, and others who served with him and knew him in the army, to refer to such a base calumny. But there are silly old women and simple minded men who credulously believe partisan caricatures are true life like pictures.

"You might as well make such a charge against one of your prominent business men in Polo, who you all see, from day to day, regularly attending to his business affairs. I know that General Grant is not a drunkard; I never saw him take a drink of liquor—never met a man that would say that General Grant was in the habit of drinking spirituous liquors. It is a preposterous charge and a foul slander.

"He is a simple hearted, plain, honest, noble man. He did his duty nobly as a General. He never spent his time plotting and trying to keep Sherman and his other generals down. He was not like McClellan, plotting to be President. No. In the White house he is the same plain, honest, earnest man, trying to do his duty faithfully, governing

forty millions of people, and he is doing it really better than they thought he could. He is a stable, firm man, going plainly forward and doing well all the time; not like Greeley, vacillating, changing, to-day shouting "On to Richmond," tomorrow sighing and negotiating for peace though it further dishearten the desponding and jeopardize the Union cause. But I cannot contrast Grant and Greeley; Greeley is the changing wind—Grant the enduring rock."

He is charged also with neglecting the public business and with absence from the seat of government. What branch of the public business has been neglected? What duty of the President has ever been left unperformed? The President retires from the scalding heats of Washington to a place by the seaside, eight hours distant by rail, and in constant communication by telegraph. In days when there were neither, Washington spent weeks of his administration at Mount Vernon, five or six days distant from Philadelphia, and took a long journey through New England. John Adams spent seven months at one time at Braintree, conducting the whole business of the presidency by correspondence. Jefferson was at home a considerable, though not an equal, time.

He is charged also with nepotism, with putting his relations into office.

Nine persons, relatives of the President or his wife, are all that have held political office under Grant. His father is postmaster in Kentucky, appointed by Andrew Johnson. What would have been said by his enemies if Grant, in the time of his own prosperity, had turned his old father out. Of the others, all but two were appointed in the ordinary way on the recommendation of the local representatives as being the choice of the neighborhood where they belonged. Two only were the President's personal choice, the marshal of the District of Columbia, and the minister to Guatemala, the President's cousin. I think it would have been better if the President had not made these appointments. One, however, sustains confidential relations with him, and the other was highly recommended.

But the office of Vice president is also of vast importance. It is the second office in the government. The vice president has the casting vote in the senate and determines all great questions where that body is equally divided. But, far more important still, he is to succeed to the Presidency in case it become vacant. His principles and character are the safeguard of the Republic against the hazards of a single life. Of fourteen Presidents, three—more than 21 per cent—have died in office, two a natural death, one by the hand of the assassin. That this may be attempted again is by no means an impossibility.

I have in my hand a newspaper called the *Caucasian*, published at Lexington, Mo. It

is a paper which has been published several years. It is on excellent paper, good type, with large and prosperous circulation. Its publisher is said to have boasted that he was the first person to suggest the assassination of Lincoln. Some of Greeley's recent letters on politics are addressed to him. I find in this paper the following article:

It is headed with the cut of a pistol and these words:

A DERRINGER RESORT.

"If, after the oppressed people of this country shall have done all in their power to prevent the re-election of the cold-blooded, bribe-taking villain, Ulysses S. Tumblebug, he shall, by the use of corrupt means, re-install himself and his army of hungry, vampirical, egg-sucking, skillet-licking kin in office:

"Then there still remains a hope, a last, but sure and final, resort,—the dernier resort. The Jewish high priest, Caiaphas, expressed that last resort eighteen hundred years ago, in these beautiful and patriotic words: '*It is expedient for us that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not.*'"

This threat is made against Grant, not on account of the matter which Sumner charges, but these which he claims Mr. Greeley will do as well.

Now whom are we asked to take for this high office of the vice presidency, without a vote for whom you cannot vote for Mr. Greeley?

He is a cousin and intimate associate of Frank Blair, one of that famous Blair family whose characteristics you well know. He is a duelist—the hero of a noted duel before the war. But also the evidence comes to us from his own friends, in a shape that we cannot resist, that he is a drunkard. God forbid that I should make this charge lightly, or make it at all on my own responsibility. I read from the *Springfield Republican* of the 2d of the present month:

"The mention of his name calls up the fresh and therefore still vivid recollection of certain recent discreditable performances at Cincinnati and New Haven; but it calls up little or nothing else. \* \* Brown is a Kentucky gentleman. He has deplorable weaknesses; witness Cincinnati and New Haven. He is intensely self-conscious, and he is liable to get drunk. So are a great many other Kentucky gentlemen. \* \* With regard to the question of habit, perhaps we have said enough already. There is every excuse to be made for the man. He has been brought up in a society where to be abstinent is to be eccentric. He is of a high-strung, nervous organization; like Lieutenant Cassio, he has poor and unhappy brains for drinking. He knows his weakness and struggles with it manfully; his intemperance is not an habitual, everyday affair like that of certain pillars of the

state whom we might mention, but exceptional and comparatively infrequent. During his term of service in the Senate we believe he did not once give occasion for a breath of scandal. But there is no excuse to be made for the candidate. If the current stories are true, he has been wanting to himself, to his friends, to the cause which lies so near his heart, to the high trust reposed in him by two great conventions of his countrymen. We have said, and we repeat, that he ought to go off the ticket, and retire from the canvass. It is the least and the only reparation that he can now make."

Mr. Sumner, in his noble judgment on the impeachment of Andrew Johnson, said: "The speeches are a revelation of himself, not materially different from well known incidents; but they serve to exhibit him in his true character. They were the utterances of a drunken man and yet it does not appear that he was drunk. The drunkenness of Andrew Johnson, when he took the oath as Vice President, was not 'official,' but who will say it was not an impeachable offence?" And yet, the leading newspaper which supports the Greeley ticket expresses the belief that Mr. Brown has, while a candidate for your suffrages, committed this offence, which, if committed after his induction into office would, according to Mr. Sumner, be impeachable. Here then is your candidate for the vice presidency, whom you are asked to unite in supporting with Mr. Donan, who would recommend the assassination of President Grant. A member of the Blair family, chiefly known to the country by his organization of the bolt in Missouri, whose "real object," Mr. Greeley declared, "was to hand over the state to the sham Democracy," and whose fruit was the election of Frank Blair to the Senate, whom Mr. Greeley describes as "a violent, versatile and able adventurer;" a duelist, admitted by the *Springfield Republican* to be guilty of what Mr. Sumner says is an impeachable offence, if committed while holding the office to which he aspires!

The man who could vote for Gratz Brown, under the circumstances, could vote a second time for Andrew Johnson. Put in your vote for Gratz Brown, if you will; but, when you have done it, turn round to your children and tell them that their father deems a duelist and a drunkard a suitable person to be President of the United States, in case the office become vacant. But this is far from being all; perhaps not even the worst of Gratz Brown. I read from a description of his conduct at the convention which nominated him, from the same leading supporter.

"Meantime Gov. Brown and his relative, Frank Blair, arrived, burning with personal disappointment, with mortified vanity, and plans of revenge upon men who, they sup-

posed, had betrayed them. The result had its chief final impulse in the abandonment of Gov. Brown of his allies of the central west, and his carrying over to Mr. Greeley the unnatural votes he had gathered for himself. Mr. Blair was upon the platform during the final proceedings, and made no concealment of his share in his transaction. Gov. Brown's conduct was natural enough to a man of over-weening vanity and passionate nature. He felt that he had been betrayed. But he was not betrayed. He never had a chance for this nomination for the presidency, from the day the movement assumed national proportions. That he allowed himself to so misapprehend the truth, and misapprehending it, to take such revenge, not only upon his personal friends and faithful servants: but upon his allies in the early history or this reform movement, and himself be the direct instrument of nominating a protection president by a convention which he himself called, upon a revenue reform platform, all constitutes a case of personal weakness and cruel injustice as well as political infidelity."

This is a description by Mr. Bowles of his own candidate for the vice presidency.

In this tempest of hatred and revenge the nomination was born which means *reconciliation*.

The bolt which Mr. Brown organized in Missouri, Mr. Greeley himself declared, in his paper of Nov. 30, 1870, "was predetermined," its "a pretext,—a sham," and "its real object to hand over the state to the sham Democracy." In the convention at Cincinnati, Mr. Brown has but repeated himself.

Contrast with this record the life and services of Henry Wilson. We all know him through and through. What a life of labor! What a life of service! What a life of honor! From a humble day laborer at the shoemaker's bench, he has become one of the leaders of the Senate. Passionately fond of knowledge, he has become, self-taught, perhaps the best informed man in the country in her political history. A passionate lover of liberty, he ranged himself early on the unpopular side, and, by his labor and organizing power, has done more than any one man in the country to build up the great party that abolished slavery. Never resting, never thinking anything done while aught remained to do in the service of freedom, he has crowded into one life the labors of ten. Hardly a populous locality in the North, that is not familiar with his voice. His congressional labors have been equally great. Gen. Scott declared that, in the one short session of 1861, as chairman of the committee on military affairs, he did more than had been accomplished by all previous chairmen for twenty years.

"After the first Bull Run battle he returned

to Massachusetts, and by his personal labors raised two thousand three hundred men. Among the numerous bills introduced by Henry Wilson was one to raise five hundred thousand men for three years to enforce the laws, one to increase the pay of private soldiers, one to facilitate the discharge of disabled soldiers, one to improve the organization of the cavalry forces, one, a second bill, to increase the pay of soldiers. This bill caused an increase of five dollars per month. One to incorporate a national military and naval asylum for disabled officers and soldiers; one to accept, organize and arm colored men for military purposes, and to make free the mothers, wives and children of all colored soldiers, one providing that all colored persons should, on being mustered into the United States service, become free, one to incorporate a national freedman's bank. He introduced the bill which abolished slavery in the district of Columbia, and which became a law April 16, 1862, thereby making 3000 slaves free forever and slavery forever impossible in the national capital. The bill to make colored persons a part of the militia, and to authorize the President to receive them into the military and naval service, and to make free the mothers, wives and children of all such persons, was introduced by Henry Wilson, and passed July 17, 1862. He advocated the emancipation of the slaves of the south as far back as 1835. He introduced a provision, which became a law on the 21st of March, 1862, providing that persons of color in the district of Columbia should be subject to the same laws to which white persons were subject; that they should be tried for offences against the laws in the same manner in which white persons are tried, and if convicted to be liable to the same penalty, and no other, to which white persons would be liable for the same offence. This act nullified the brutalizing, degrading and inhuman black code of the district. He introduced innumerable bills securing to the soldiers their bounties, pensions, back pay and all other rights which they so dearly earned. In addition to his vast labors in Congress he traveled through the states and delivered more than one hundred speeches in support of the war and in vindication of the anti-slavery policy of the government.

"For thirty-two years he has toiled in public life for the right, the culture and elevation of all men, without distinction of race or color. When the amendment to the enrollment act was pending in the house, it was so amended as to make colored men, whether free or slave, a part of the national forces, and their masters were to receive a bounty when they should give freedom to slaves who might be drafted into the service. In the committee of conference Mr. Wilson moved that the slaves drafted into the service should be made free by the au-

thority of the government the moment they entered it. His motion was agreed to, it became the law of the land, and Gen. Palmer reported that in Kentucky alone more than twenty thousand slaves were made free by it.

"Mr. Wilson introduced a bill which became a law, making the wives and children of colored soldiers free, and Gen. Palmer, then commanding the United States forces in Kentucky, in an official report, made six months after the passage of that act, estimated that 75,000 women and children were made free by it. Tens of thousands of the wives and children of such soldiers in the states of Delaware, Maryland, West Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee and Missouri were thus made free under Mr. Wilson's measures. Mr. Wilson introduced into the appropriation bill of 1864 a section providing that who had been or who might be mustered into the military service should receive the same uniform, clothing, arms, equipments, rations, medical attendance and pay as white soldiers. He reported from the committee of conference, to which had been referred the bill in relation to the freedmen's bureau, an entirely new bill, to establish in the war department a bureau for the relief of freedmen and refugees, which became a law, under which that beneficent instrumentality, the freedman's bureau, was organized. On Mr. Wilson's motion, the provision was adopted that the land sold for taxes in South Carolina should be divided into lots of forty acres each and sold at low rates, under which act many freedmen obtained homesteads. Mr. Wilson introduced the bill abolishing peonage in New Mexico, the provision striking the word white from the militia law, and also the measure that in the reconstructed states. Mr. Wilson introduced in 1863 a bill, which became a law, incorporating an institution for the education of colored youth in the District of Columbia, the act incorporating the Howard University, and also the act to incorporate the Freedman's savings bank. Mr. Wilson also introduced many other measures in relation to slavery, and the rights of persons of color, either as independent measures, or as amendments to measures introduced by others."

This list of his labors has been taken from the records by another hand.

Add to all this that, though poor, amid vast opportunities, his hands have been free from the suspicion of a stain. Social and genial, travelling day and night, living for sixteen years in the temptations of Washington, his simple and temperate life is one which you may well hold up for your children's imitation.

Such are the questions and such the candidates. But it is not the merits of the candidates alone that is to determine your choice. You cannot, if you would, separate the candidate from his supporters,

From the ranks of those who support him will the President select his cabinet and subordinates. Nearly one-third of the Senate is to be elected within six months. His triumph will bring into the Senate, from every State where he is successful, men selected from the same ranks. The same ranks will close together in the choice of the entire House of Representatives. So clearly is this understood by your opponents, that Mr. Sumner's letter, nominally addressed to a few colored men in Washington, where they have no vote for President, was in fact so timed as to secure, if possible, the election of Zeb Vance to the Senate,—an uncompromising and unrepentant rebel, who desired to "fill hell so full of Yankees that their feet would stick out of the windows;" and of eight Democratic representatives, one of them the brother of Vance, over the candidates of the colored men and the loyal Republicans. Mr. Greeley, reconsidering his purpose, wrote a letter of acceptance in which he complained of Gov. Vance's exclusion from the Senate, when previously elected.

Now, who are the men who make up the party of Mr. Greeley, and whom his election would bring into power? I cannot better describe them than in the language of Mr. Sumner describing the party of Andrew Johnson: "Original partisans of slavery, North and South, habitual compromisers of great principles; maligners of the Declaration of Independence; politicians without heart; and a promiscuous company who at every stage of the battle have set their faces against equal rights—these are his allies. *It is the troop of slavery with a few recruits.*"

I do not forget that in all this I am compelled to differ with one with whom for my whole political life hitherto it has been my pleasure to agree on all questions of national policy. I would not speak of him otherwise than with honor. The habits of a lifetime are too strong. I cannot name in public the name of Charles Sumner and words of eulogy not spring, unbidden, to the lips. He has been a brave, persistent, honest advocate of liberty. He has stood on a lofty height. He never has appealed to a mean motive in the people, and has never, I am sure, been consciously guided by one himself. But we cannot give up our judgment, even to his. If there is any one lesson to be learned from this life it is the lesson of independence. Woe to that people who in grave public emergencies trust to any judgment but their own. The people of Worcester have delighted to act with Mr. Sumner since he made his first speech in 1848. But they have followed their own convictions, not yielded even to his authority. Some of you have been engaged in the warfare for human liberty longer even than Mr. Sumner. You would have done the same thing even if he had never lived. You would have done the same thing if he had been en-



the other side.

Mr. Sumner, in my judgment, in his recent speech and letters has done a great wrong to the President, has done a great wrong to you, and a greater wrong than all to himself. He is bitterly estranged from the President. But we need not utterly condemn him, even if we find him guilty of great injustice. Many notable instances have occurred in history of public men, alienated wholly from each other, while the world loves and honors both. One instance is found in the career of an English statesman, to whom Mr. Sumner bears no inconsiderable resemblance. I mean Edmund Burke. Mr. Sumner has the same fearless courage, the same vast scholarship, the same lofty eloquence, the same unconquerable and generous love of liberty. Yet Burke quarreled foolishly and bitterly with Fox. The generous Fox, with the tears streaming down his cheeks, begged that there might be no loss of friendship. Burke rejected his advances, and, at another time, is said by one biographer, to have spoken in a "scream of passion." Burke cruelly wronged his friend, while in their dissensions freedom suffered.

An instance even better known to you is that of our own Hamilton and Adams. Their dissensions went so far as to destroy the supremacy of the federal party. It was only by one vote after a struggle of months, which threatened to rend the union itself in sunder, that the country escaped the danger of electing to the Presidency the traitor Aaron Burr, as the result of Hamilton's conduct. The people love Hamilton, and love and honor brave and honest old John Adams. Which was right in the original quarrel nobody now cares but their descendants. If Mr. Sumner shall succeed, less fortunate than Hamilton, he will bring into power a whole congress of Aaron Burrs.

I am not reluctant to submit to any candid man the question, Do you find in Mr. Sumner's speech the state of mind anxious to do justice to a great public servant, to the trusted candidate of the people of Massachusetts, to which he owes his own honors, nay, even strongest obligation of all to a generous mind—to the man whom he accounted his enemy? Fortunately there are some of Mr. Sumner's charges of which the American people have a means of knowledge better than his own. He charges Gen. Grant with being an egotist and a quarreller. As to this Gen. Grant passed an ordeal in the eyes of the American people on a lofty scene to which even the Senate chamber is obscure.

Gen. Grant an egotist and a quarreller? Do not the American people know better? You have heard Mr. Greeley's testimony. There is no ordeal of the temper like the ordeal of military life. Every officer knows now hard it is to repress this constant temp-

tation. Yet Grant, of all our Generals, always gives credit to others. If you are in his company, he will tell you of the deeds of Sheridan, of Sherman, of Meade, of McPherson, but never of his own.

I commend to Mr. Sumner the language of Lord Digby in his famous speech to the English peers.

"Let every man wipe his heart as he does his eyes, when he would judge of a nice and subtle object. The eye, if it be pre-tinctured with any color is vitiated in its discerning. Beware of a bloodshot eye in judgment. Let every man purge his heart clean of all passions. I know the great and wise body politic can have none, but I speak to individuals from the weakness I find in myself."—*Lord Digby's Speech for Stratford.*

Ought not Mr. Sumner to ask himself if he may not possibly be wrong? Whether something has not distorted his vision and disturbed his judgment so that he cannot see things in their true relations? He declared in the Senate that Mr. Stanton told him when on his deathbed that Gen. Grant was unfit for the presidency, and that in the last presidential canvass, while supporting the Republican party, he had never named the name of General Grant. Yet nothing is more certain as appears from the speeches themselves, than that Mr. Stanton many times praised Grant by name and at length, eulogizing in the highest terms both his civil and military capacity. Stanton never told Mr. Sumner what he says he did, though, of course, Mr. Sumner believes it. Can he not himself see that some strong passion is unconsciously clouding his memory?

He charges the president with neglecting Mr. Douglass. Mr. Douglass himself denies the charge, and explains the circumstance. Was not his eye here also "pre-tinctured with some color and vitiated in its discerning?"

He charges the president with being an "egotist and a quareller." The whole country knows the contrary. Here, too, will he not "beware of a bloodshot eye in judgment?" He alludes to Grant's letter to the colored people of Washington at their meeting in favor of the civil rights bill, and calls it juggling and evasive. He quotes only the last sentence, and leaves out what precedes it, where the president expressly states his regret that he "shall not be able to participate with you in person in your efforts to further the cause in which you are laboring." The cause in which they were laboring being the passage of the civil rights bill. I read you the whole letter:

EXECUTIVE MANSION,

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 9, 1872.

Gentlemen: I am in receipt of your invitation extended to me to attend a mass meeting to be held for the purpose of aiding in securing civil

rights for the colored citizens of our country. I regret that a previous engagement will detain me at the Executive Mansion this evening, and that I shall not be able to participate with you in person in your efforts to further the cause in which you are laboring. I beg to assure you, however, that I sympathize most cordially in any effort to secure for all our people, of whatever race, nativity, or color, the exercise of those rights to which every citizen should be entitled.

I am, very respectfully,

U. S. GRANT.

Does not the heart which finds in that letter juggle or evasion need "to purge itself clear of all passions?"

Mr. Sumner greatly wrongs the President when he says "he never, but as a soldier, did anything against slavery, and never, at any time showed any sympathy with the colored race." Mr. Sumner is mistaken, as the people of the country know. President Grant's timely message, when Congress was in dissension, ensured the passage of the klu-klux bill, and saved thousands of humble homes from outrage and wrong at the hands of Mr. Sumner's present allies. The President's message in behalf of education will do more practical good for the colored race than could ever be done by a wilderness of Horace Greeleys.

Mr. Sumner also does a great wrong to you. He does you an infinite injustice when he says the convention at Philadelphia was "composed of delegates chosen largely under the influence of office holders, who assembled to sustain what is known as Grantism." Mr. Sumner had no right to say that. In saying it he is hurried by his passion into an insult to Massachusetts and to you. Among the 3,500,000 Republican voters there was substantial unanimity. No other candidate was named but Mr. Colfax, who withdrew early in the canvass and wrote a letter declaring that the public will was unmistakably for Grant. Did you act under the control of postmasters? What a responsibility for Gen. Pickett!

Mr. Sumner wrongs us all when he charges those who differ with him with hatred to the South. Not an act, not a word of hatred has come from the victors in the recent struggle. All that the vanquished even complain of has been done with Mr. Sumner's full approbation. The only expressions of hate come from those with whom he is now acting.

Mr. Sumner also wrongs the people when he says "the speeches praising Grant are by office holders and members of rings." You know better than Mr. Sumner from whose hearts come the praises which have followed the services of Gen. Grant.

He also wrongs the people when he declares that "if any valued friend separate from me now, it is because he places a man

above principles." The national Republican convention, when all Mr. Sumner's indictment was before the country, unanimously renominated the President. In that act the Republicans of Massachusetts took their full share. Mr. Sumner, therefore, means to impute to them that they place "a man above principles," or else to say to them that he does not value their friendship.

Mr. Sumner also does infinite injustice to himself. In a moment of headstrong passion with a few prominent Republicans from other states, every one of whom so far as I know them, has suffered some personal disappointment as to office or power, he disregards the judgment of Massachusetts and the will of her people. In whose friendship does he find an equivalent? Not certainly in Mr. Fenton's, not certainly in Mr. Trumbull's, of whom he declared within two years in the Senate—"How often have we been obliged to encounter his influence as we were seeking to lay the foundations of peace and reconciliation in this Republic? How often has he shown his tenderness for the remains of the rebellion and refused to join us in trampling it out? He has been the persisting enemy of the suffrage of the colored race," comparing him, in his record, to a sick man turning himself on an uneasy bed. Will he find it in Mr. Schurz, who has voted steadily against the civil rights bill, and every attempt to protect the colored man, in the Senate? Will he find it in Mr. Tipton, of whom we may perhaps say, as was said of Addington:—

"And but little though he meant,  
He meant that little well."

I see that Mr. Davis says that "Achilles will not sulk in his tent." Alas for our Achilles: he has drawn his sword and aimed his blow at the leader of his own cause in the very midst of the battle, though wisdom herself pluck him by the locks and bid him forbear.

Mr. Sumner says the President should never be re-elected, but the constitution is otherwise. The American people, in fullest consideration, have adopted a different policy. Mr. Sumner's argument seems to me to be based upon an assumption not creditable either to the virtue or the intelligence of the country. His argument is that if the President desires a re-election he will use unworthy means, such as the appointment of bad men to office, to compass his end. But surely, he does not claim that the road to a re-election is unworthy conduct. Surely, the Republic, whose idea is confidence in the people, assumes that the President, ambitious of re-election, will gain his object best by the highest and purest public service. What has been our experience? Has a single President held the office a second term whose re-election the American people now regret? Mr. Sumner's theory would deprive us in times of great peril

and distress of the services of tried men, and compel us to rely on men new in the Presidential office. It would have deprived us of the second term of Washington and of the second term of Lincoln; of the second term of Lincoln for whose re-election Mr. Sumner himself was a strenuous advocate.

The one Presidential term theory comes to this: Mr. Greeley is opposed to the re-election of the President when he wants the office himself, and Mr. Sumner would have the constitution forbid the re-election of such a President as he does not like.

Mr. Sumner says this means *reconciliation*. Does it mean reconciliation? Do the rebels of the South take Mr. Greeley and the Cincinnati platform because they desire reconciliation for because, having exhausted every form of resistance, they are satisfied that they could not get a rebel and a Democrat? Does anybody doubt that if the elections in New Hampshire, in Oregon, in Connecticut, had given reasonable promise of a Democratic victory, the overtures of Mr. Greeley, and the alliance of Mr. Sumner would have been spurned with contempt? They seek to substitute Greeley for Grant today just as they would have been glad to substitute McClellan for Grant at the head of our armies during the war. Undoubtedly they like Greeley's principles better than Grant's. They like the generalship of Bull Run better than the generalship of Vicksburg. They like his principle that States have a right to secede. They like his talk about a dominant race. They will accept reconciliation with him just so far as he will consent to be their tool in revenging themselves on the men who subdued their rebellion and the men who deprived them of their slaves.

One or two simple facts ought to settle the question in any candid mind. When the civil rights bill was offered in the house, the Democrats used up the morning hour in filibustering during every Monday of the session, thereby preventing a vote.

When the bill to aid education passed the house, distributing the proceeds of the public lands according to illiteracy for the common schools, every Democrat from the South but two voted to reject the boon.

Several times during the session did the Democratic party vote against a declaration that the three great amendments were binding; although just before adjournment some of them voted to accept them, they all voted against the legislation for their enforcement. Wherever the Democracy get power in the South, the common school system goes down.

To whom are these men reconciled? Not to General Grant. They hate him because he saved the Republic. They hate him because he put down the Ku-Klux, although in both he but did his duty to his country, and executed the will of the people. Their

speeches and their presses are filled with expressions of hatred to us. Not to the colored men of the South, not to the loyal emigrant from the North. For them they have the Ku-Klux Klan. Not even to Mr. Sumner. The *Richmond Enquirer* has declared, since Mr. Sumner's letter, that the people of the South despise Charles Sumner as they despise Cuffee. They may be reconciled to Horace Greeley, the man who believed in the right of secession under the constitution, the man who was for paying for the slaves, the man who bailed Jeff Davis, the man who is for leaving the civil rights of the colored man to be determined by the dominant race.

We offered them reconciliation in 1860. They had only to submit quietly to an election under the constitution, by a majority of the American people. We offered them reconciliation in 1868. They had only to let men live in peace in their dwellings. They now impose, as a condition of reconciliation, that we shall let them select our candidate for the presidency.

Will you tell me why any person who really favors reconciliation at the South should not vote for Gen. Grant?

One other consideration strikes me pretty forcibly. If the rebels of the South are reconciled to the colored men: if the feelings which prompted them to buy and sell and scourge the colored men have passed away and given place to love and kindness, why have not the colored men of the South, who live and work by their side, found it out? How happens that they hear of it first from Mr. Sumner, and don't believe it at that?

Mr. Sumner commends to you reconciliation. Let him show a little willingness to be reconciled to President Grant. He can overlook the four years of bloody war, the death of half a million of his countrymen, the attempt on the life of the Republic, the holding millions of his countrymen in slavery on the part of men who still justify and boast of their exploits, but he cannot forgive the maintaining Bacz against hostilities from Hayti during a negotiation and the abandoned attempt to annex St. Domingo. He can write a letter to aid the election of Zebulon Vance to the United States Senate, who wanted to fill hell so full of Yankees that their feet would stick out of the window and who never has repented of the utterance, but he cannot forgive President Grant for detailing a couple of boys from the army to aid him as clerks at the White House. He can forgive the attempt to destroy the Union, the benignant mother of us all, but he cannot forgive the man who saved it, if he has put a few of his kinsmen into office. And this is reconciliation.

This nomination was not made for reconciliation by either convention. Two parties went to Cincinnati. One, honest and zealous enthusiasts, seeking better government

than earth affords. These returned baffled and disgusted to renew their support of Gen. Grant. The others, represented by the Blairs and Gratz Brown of Missouri, by Fenton of New York, by McClure of Pennsylvania, led and managed the meeting. They chose their candidate, not for reform, not for reconciliation, but as a man who could be the tool of managing politicians.

It is not so taken by the Democrats. They take it as a pill or an emetic. Gratz Brown, in his letter of acceptance, declares that neither party has changed its principles. Beck of Kentucky, a leading member of the house, declares, if he is correctly reported, that they take Greeley only as a means of overthrowing Grant. The *Richmond Enquirer*, a leading Democratic paper of the South, gives Mr. Sumner's letter, rejects his claim of reconciliation with contempt, and says that "the South despise Charles Sumner as they despise Cuffee." I read you from the speech of Representative Golladay of Tennessee, when he says that Greeley will do what Senter did in Tennessee. Remember that Senter's election in Tennessee deprived 150,000 children of public schools.

"Congressman E. J. Golladay of Tennessee supports Greeley for the presidency, and has been telling his constituents why. We quote a few sentences from his speech. He told his hearers that Greeley would do for the Democratic party what Gratz Brown did in Missouri, Senter in Tennessee, and Walker in Virginia. In accepting Greeley, the Democracy had not abandoned their principles, and, in adopting their platform, they had not ignored their record in the past. They recognized the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth constitutional amendments as an existing fact, in the same sense that we recognize that Cain killed Abel, and that Judas betrayed Christ. The Democracy did not believe they were just, or constitutionally accepted. He said Greeley best suited the South of any man in the nation. He had done more, and was willing to do more, for her than any other man could. Greeley, at the outset of the war, was in favor of letting the 'wayward sisters depart in peace,' and afterward went, single-handed and alone, to meet our commissioners in Canada to treat for peace. Not a Democrat in the North dared go with him, or manifested any desire to go. He was then in favor of paying the South for her slaves, and I believe he is still. He went on Jeff. Davis's bond, while not a Northern Democrat so much as lifted a finger for his release. He immediately advocated universal amnesty, and opposed the execution of any Southern man for treason. He had denounced in bitterest terms the carpet-baggers, and called them the plunderers of the South. He is one of us."

Mr. Sumner complained of the Senate

that they violated parliamentary courtesy in not giving an investigation which he moved to a committee of his friends, saying that they put out the child to a nurse who cared not for it. But he is now for putting out the new born babe of liberty to a nurse who would strangle it.

The key-note of this whole movement is the renewal of the old, exploded doctrine of State rights. The words may vary but the tune is always the same. Sometimes the song is "no centralization," which means that the nation shall not protect loyal lives when the States fail. Sometimes it is "down with carpet-baggers," which means that the constitutional rights of citizens to dwell where they choose in the whole country shall not be respected.

Two hands stretch out to you. One is the hand of the southern loyalist, a true, honest hand, never raised in hatred, even against his bitterest foe. The other, stained with blood, stretches over a chasm filled with the blood itself has shed. While the hand stretches over the chasm the voice utters nothing but threats and curses. I am afraid the man who stretches his hand over the chasm may possibly drag us into it. Mr. Sumner compares the Republican party to a life-boat, which swims upon every wave. The life-boat, indeed, may be saved. The crew itself may not perish. I for one would not like to put to sea in a storm even in a life boat with Horace Greeley, as his friends describe him, for captain, and Brown for second officer, to succeed to the helm. I think even a life-boat in some peril when a pirate ship is seeking to run her down. A pirate is never more dangerous than when she hoists false colors. But suppose the boat and the crew survive, what becomes of the lives which the boat has put forth to save? While the men on board are quarreling, their sinking brethren perish.

Fellow citizens, how can you hesitate? Is there anything in the Republican record which any Republican would blot out? Is there anything in the Democratic record which any honest Democrat would not wish to blot out? How can you hesitate between the two candidates? Greeley would have let the South go; Grant would have conquered them. Greeley encouraged the rebellion; Grant destroyed it. Greeley would have paid the slave owners from the national treasury; Grant would educate the freedmen. Greeley, more than any one man in the country, is responsible for Bull Run; Grant for Donelson, Henry, Vicksburg, Appomattox. Greeley would leave the colored man half a slave, dissuade him from asserting his own constitutional right, and recognize a dominant race, as still existing under the constitution; Grant would enforce for him those civil rights which every citizen ought to have. Greeley would denounce

centralism and return to the old mischievous doctrine of state rights; Grant would protect human rights by the strongest exertion of the national power. Greeley's friends are every rebel, every opponent of the war, every Tammany Democrat, every man who is soured and dissatisfied; Grant's, the entire army of freedom, who have won her victories, by sea and land, in war and in peace.

It is a great thing to change the administration of the government. New issues, new questions, and new dangers, constantly, must arise. To which party will you trust the Republic? I have not spoken of your business interests. What in your judgment, will become of them in the hands of the Democrats, with nothing but Horace Gree-

ley for a restraint? Nothing but financial disaster can be the result. You must expect legislation hostile to all your interests; capital must live under different laws; workmen must seek new occupations; our growing cities and towns must lose their stimulus. Hatreds will survive and discords again spring up, with the revived power for mischief of those who have hitherto caused them.

On the other hand, under the same wise and safe legislation, you may hope for a more rapid growth, an ample return for capital, better reward for labor, a more assured quiet, a larger prosperity; and, under their beneficial influence, what is best and happiest yet, "a nobler liberty, a better friendship, a purer justice, a more lasting brotherhood."

### ANECDOTE OF GRANT.

From the Worcester Evening Gazette, Aug. 16th.]

Mr. Hoar told an anecdote of Grant in his speech, the other night, which does not appear in the published report, printed from this manuscript. He remarked in introducing it that he felt some hesitation for obvious reasons in repeating the story, but there would perhaps be no impropriety in relating to his friends and neighbors what had appeared to him a remarkable illustration of the modesty and generosity of Grant's character. The anecdote is so fresh and interesting, that we take the liberty of reproducing it in our columns; we can see no reason why it should be left buried till some antiquarian, fifty years hence it may be, digs it out from the musty correspondence of somebody who happened to be present with Mr. Hoar on the occasion.

Mr. Hoar related the story substantially as follows:—

"I had the honor a short time since of dining at the house of a friend, then and now a member of the Cabinet, in company with the President. There were about twenty guests, but they constituted perhaps the most distinguished assemblage it ever has been or ever will be my fortune to see. Several members of the Cabinet, several of the most distinguished members of the Sen-

ate, the Chief Justice of the United States, Generals Sherman and Sheridan, some officers of high rank in the Navy, two or three eminent men of science, and perhaps the most famous poet of the country, Mr. James Russell Lowell, were of the company. Commodore Alden remarked, half in jest, to a gentleman who sat near him that there was nothing he disliked more than a subordinate who always obeyed orders. 'What is that you are saying, Commodore?' said President Grant, across the table. The Commodore repeated what he had said. 'There is a good deal of truth in what you say,' said General Grant. 'One of the virtues of General Sheridan was that he knew when to act without orders. Just before the surrender of Lee, General Sheridan captured some despatches from which he learned that Lee had ordered his supplies to a certain place. I was on the other side of the river, where he could not get communication from me till the next morning. General Sherman pushed on at once without orders, got to the place fifteen minutes before the rebels and captured the supplies. After the surrender was concluded, the first thing General Lee asked me for was rations for his men. I issued to them the same provisions which Sheridan had captured. Now if Sheridan, as most men would have done, had waited for orders from me, Lee would have got off.' I listened with wonder to the generous modesty which before that brilliant company could remove one of the proudest laurels from his own brow to place it on the brow of Sheridan."

OFFICERS OF THE GRANT AND WILSON CLUB,  
OF WORCESTER, MASS.

---

PRESIDENT.

GEORGE F. HOAR.

VICE PRESIDENTS.

Stephen Salisbury, P. L. Moen, E. W. Pond, George M. Rice, William Dickinson, George Crompton, F. H. Knodturt, Moses S. Johnson, Mowry Lapham, Lewis Barnard, Wm. H. Jourdan, C. E. Metcalf, John Gates, Charles H. Doe, E. C. Taylor, George Coor.	John D. Baldwin, George W. Richardson, Charles L. Farnham, Wm. T. Merrifield, William S. Lincoln, F. Emory Atterich, Harrison Bliss, D. S. Messenger, O. L. Hatch, Chas. B. Pratt, S. R. Heywood, John D. Washburn, J. L. Tucker, Thomas H. Plimlett, A. N. Carter, A. B. Pratt, S. J. Wileox.
--	--

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

*At Large.*

F. P. Goodling, George F. Thompson, George S. Barton.	A. A. Goodell, J. R. Torrey, S. M. Richardson, Leopold Strauss.
---	--

Ward 1. A. D. Warren, " 2. L. H. Wells, " 3. D. D. Wiley, " 4. G. P. Kennerick.	Ward 5. E. S. Pike, " 6. J. H. Walker, " 7. Edwin Ames, " 8. E. B. Stoddard.
--	---

SECRETARIES.

Nathaniel Pelee.	H. L. Shumway.
------------------	----------------

TREASURER.

J. P. Knox.













LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 013 789 541 9